

**Attachment 1**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INTERMOUNTAIN  
REGION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM SURVEY**

# NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INTERMOUNTAIN REGION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM SURVEY



This survey will help us measure the strengths and weaknesses of the National Park Service (NPS) Intermountain Region and Region VIII Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Partnership Program, which was designed to facilitate improved waste management, pollution prevention, and regulatory compliance in national parks.

## GENERAL

**1. What is your position within the park?**

- ☐ Maintenance Worker
- ☐ Resource Manager
- ☐ Superintendent
- ☐ Law Enforcement Ranger
- ☐ Other

\_\_\_\_\_

**2. How many years have you worked for the NPS?**

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 1 to 5 Years
- ☐ 6 to 10 Years
- ☐ 11 to 15 Years
- ☐ > 15 years

**3. How many years have you worked in this Park?**

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 1 to 5 Years
- ☐ 6 to 10 Years
- ☐ 11 to 15 Years
- ☐ > 15 years

Please specify the name of your park \_\_\_\_\_

## JOINING THE PARTNERSHIP

**4. How did you learn that technical assistance was available from the NPS/EPA Partnership? (Check all that apply.)**

- ☐ Participation in training led to involvement
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by EPA
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by NPS
- ☐ Newsletter
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Agency Website
- ☐ Publication
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Did you make the decision to accept the technical assistance that was offered in this partnership? If your answer is yes, please skip to question 7. If your answer is no, please continue with question 6.**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**6. Had it been your decision, would you have accepted the technical assistance?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**7. If the EPA had approached your park on its own with the offer of technical assistance, would you have accepted it?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Why or why not? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Did you receive assurances that the information would not be used in an enforcement action? If your answer is no, please skip to question 10. If your answer is yes, please continue with question 9.

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Would you have accepted technical assistance if you had not received some assurances that the information collected would not be used in an enforcement action?

☐ Yes ☐ No

10. Did the potential to benefit from any of the following increase your enthusiasm for the program?

Technical assistance that meets the needs of your park ☐ Yes ☐ No

Cost savings ☐ Yes ☐ No

Opportunity to leverage resources not previously offered ☐ Yes ☐ No

Opportunity to collaborate with new colleagues ☐ Yes ☐ No

Pollution Prevention (P2) assessment ☐ Yes ☐ No

Help meeting my park's environmental goals ☐ Yes ☐ No

Professional exposure/recognition ☐ Yes ☐ No

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

11. If respondent is the superintendent, please detail how you notified your staff of the Park's participation in this program. If not a superintendent, please skip to question 12. If you are a superintendent, please respond and skip to question 13.

---

---

---

---

---

12. If respondent is a park employee, please describe how or if you were notified about this initiative.

---

---

---

---

---

13. To what extent were you aware that the P2 compliance assistance offered to parks was a result of a partnership between NPS Intermountain Region and EPA Region VIII?

- ☐ Not aware, thought it was an EPA program.  
☐ Not aware, thought it was an NPS program.  
☐ It was clear throughout the process.  
☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

14. How much time do you devote to environmental activities each month?

- ☐ < ½ day  
☐ 1 day  
☐ 2 days  
☐ 3-5 days  
☐ 5 days  
☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**15. What tools produced by the Partnership did you or any individual working in your park find valuable?**

- ☐ Environmental Management for the NPS: Tool Kit for Environmental Management
- ☐ NPS Environmental Resource Manual: Resource Manual for Environmental Management
- ☐ Tool Kit for Solid Waste Management
- ☐ NPS Intermountain Region Environmental Compliance Audit Program
- ☐ Green Purchasing Program
- ☐ Chemical Products Clean-Out Manual
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_



## STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PARTNERSHIP

**16. What aspects of implementing environmental projects in your park were the most challenging? (Please rate each factor from one to five with one being the most challenging aspect.)**

	Most Challenging					Least Challenging
<input type="checkbox"/> Finding financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Time constraints	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Not enough staff	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Not enough technical knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Generating management support	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Justifying it within the context of park goals	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify _____						

**17. What elements of the NPS/EPA Partnerships' assistance were most effective in mitigating these difficulties? (Please rate each factor from one to five with one being the most important factor.)**

	Most Important					Least Important
Training	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Regulatory compliance information	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
P2 information (e.g., HazWaste Minimization Techniques)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Technical assistance	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Cost savings offered	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Access to additional resources	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Collaboration with new colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Help in meeting my park's goals	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Managerial encouragement for P2 or partnership	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
EPA/NPS vision/mission for P2	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Joint EPA/NPS compliance assistance (not enforcement) approach	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

**18. Did the Partnership create new challenges or intensify existing difficulties? For example, the identification of regulatory compliance violations in the course of an assessment can result in the need to re-allocate budgetary resources to address the problem.**

☐ Yes                      ☐ No

If yes, please specify the difficulties you encountered.

---



---

**19. Was the Partnership effective at assisting the Park to meet any of the following goals? (Check all that apply.)**

	<b>Park Goal</b>	<b>Partnership Assistance Effective</b>	<b>Partnership Assistance Not Effective</b>
Completing the Park's Environmental Compliance Audit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reducing solid waste through recycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reducing hazardous waste through pollution prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changing the park to green chemicals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training Park Personnel on environmental compliance issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing tools, training and technical assistance on environmental issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____			

**20. Were there P2 or other environmental operational and/or behavioral changes made as a result of the Partnership's work? (Check all that apply and rate degree of change from one to five, with one being the lowest level of change.)**

	<b>Lowest Level of Change</b>					<b>Highest Level of Change</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Conducted a chemical products clean-out	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Developed a hazardous waste management plan	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Developed a solid waste management plan	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Purchasing "green" products	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of pollution prevention options	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Additional environmental compliance issues	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____							

**21. Were there changes in management or priorities as a result of the Partnership's work? (Check all that apply and rate degree of change from one to five, with one being the lowest level of change.)**

	<b>Lowest Level of Change</b>					<b>Highest Level of Change</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Increased use of EPA technical assistance	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Systematic measurement of environmental performance	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Identification of cost savings	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)_____	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
_____							

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**22. Do you have suggestions for improving the tools, training and technical assistance you receive from the Partnership?**

---



---



---



---



---

**23. How do you feel about seeking environmental assistance from EPA?**

---



---



---



---



---

**Attachment 2**

**LIST OF NATIONAL PARKS CONTACTED  
BY STATE & EPA REGION**

## **EPA REGION 8**

### **Colorado**

Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site  
Black Canyon of The Gunnison National Park  
Colorado National Monument  
Curecanti National Recreation Area  
Dinosaur National Monument  
Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument  
Great Sand Dunes National Monument & Preserve  
Hovenweep National Monument  
Mesa Verde National Park  
Rocky Mountain National Park  
Sand Creek Project Office

### **Montana**

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area  
Glacier National Park  
Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument  
Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site

### **Utah**

Arches National Park  
Bryce Canyon National Park  
Canyonlands National Park  
Capitol Reef National Park  
Cedar Breaks National Monument  
Golden Spike National Historic Site  
National Trails System Program, IMR  
Natural Bridges National Monument  
Timpanogos Cave National Monument  
Zion National Park

### **Wyoming**

Devils Tower National Monument  
Fort Laramie National Historic Site  
Fossil Butte National Monument  
Grand Teton National Park  
Yellowstone National Park



## **EPA REGION 9**

### **Arizona**

Canyon de Chelly National Monument  
Casa Grande Ruins National Monument  
Chiricahua National Monument  
Coronado National Memorial  
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area  
Grand Canyon National Park  
Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site  
Montezuma Castle National Monument  
Navajo National Monument  
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument  
Petrified Forest National Park  
Pipe Spring National Monument  
Saguaro National Park  
Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument  
Tonto National Monument  
Tumacacori National Historical Park  
Walnut Canyon National Monument  
Wupatki National Monument

## **EPA REGION 6**

### **New Mexico**

Aztec Ruins National Monument  
Bandelier National Monument  
Capulin Volcano National Monument  
Carlsbad Caverns National Park  
Chaco Culture National Historical Park  
El Malpais National Monument  
El Morro National Monument  
Fort Union National Monument  
Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument  
Pecos National Historical Park  
Petroglyph National Monument  
Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument  
White Sands National Monument

### **Oklahoma**

Chickasaw National Recreation Area  
Oklahoma City National Memorial  
Washita Battlefield National Historic Site

### **Texas**

Amistad National Recreation  
Big Bend National Park  
Big Thicket National Preserve  
Chamizal National Memorial Cordell Roy  
Fort Davis National Historic Site  
Guadalupe Mountains National Park  
Lake Meredith National Recreation Area  
Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park  
Padre Island National Seashore  
Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site  
San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

**Attachment 3**

**NPS/EPA PARTNERSHIP SURVEY  
POST CARD FOLLOW-UP**

**NPS/EPA PARTNERSHIP SURVEY**

c/o IEc  
2067 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, MA 02140

March 17, 2003

Dear National Park Superintendent,

Last week we mailed you a survey about the NPS Intermountain Region/EPA Region VIII Partnership Program.

If you, or someone on your staff, have already completed the survey and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Your responses are extremely important to us in order to understand how to improve environmental services provided to parks. Thank you very much for your help!

Sincerely,

Beth Nicklas

**Attachment 4**

**NPS INTERMOUNTAIN REGION EPA REGION 8  
PARTNERSHIP SURVEY RESULTS**

## NPS INTERMOUNTAIN REGION EPA Region 8 PARTNERSHIP SURVEY

Sample Profile			
Region 8 States	Number of Parks	Number of Parks Surveyed	Response Rate
Colorado	11	10	91%
Montana	4	2	50%
Utah	10	8	80%
Wyoming	5	3	60%
<b>Total</b>	30	23	77%
Non-Region 8 States	Number of Parks	Number of Parks Surveyed	Response Rate
Arizona	18	15	83%
New Mexico	13	11	85%
Oklahoma	3	2	67%
Texas	11	8	73%
<b>Total</b>	45	36	80%
<b>Unidentified</b>		1	
<b>Intermountain Region Total</b>	75	60	80%
Note: Surveys were sent to 73 Parks in the Intermountain Region.			

### Respondent Profile

The following tables break down the demographic profile of respondents based on whether or not they indicated they were aware of the partnership.

NUMBER OF SURVEYS RETURNED BY STATE		
	Number of Respondents	
	Aware	Unaware
<b>Region 8 States</b>		
Colorado	6	4
Montana	2	0
Utah	3	5
Wyoming	3	0
<b>Total Region 8</b>	14	9
Percent of Region 8 Respondents	61%	39%
	Number of Respondents	
Non-Region 8 States	Aware	Unaware
Arizona	8	7
New Mexico	7	4
Oklahoma	1	1
Texas	4	4
<b>Total Non-Region 8</b>	20	16

<b>NUMBER OF SURVEYS RETURNED BY STATE</b>		
	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
	<b>Aware</b>	<b>Unaware</b>
Percent of Non-Region 8 Respondents	56%	44%
Unidentified	1	
<b>Total Respondents</b>	35	25
<b>Percent of Intermountain Region Total</b>	58%	42%

<b>Q1. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITHIN THE PARK?</b>				
<b>Park Position</b>	<b>Respondents Aware of Partnership</b>	<b>Respondents Unaware of Partnership</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Respondents Aware as Percent Total Respondents by Park Position</b>
Maintenance Worker	3	1	4	75%
Resource Manager	6	5	11	55%
Superintendent	8	11	19	42%
Law Enforcement Ranger	1	0	1	100%
Facility Manager	8	8	16	50%
Other	9	0	9	100%
<b>Total</b>	35	25	60	58%

<b>Q2. HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED FOR THE NPS?</b>				
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total Respondents by Years of Service</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total Respondents by Years of Service</b>
	<b>Aware</b>		<b>Unaware</b>	
<1 year	0	0%	1	100%
1 to 5 years	2	100%	0	0%
6 to 10 years	4	80%	1	20%
11 to 15 years	1	25%	3	75%
>15 years	28	74%	10	26%
Not Reported	0	0%	10	100%
<b>Total</b>	35	58%	25	42%

### Q3. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU WORKED IN THIS PARK?

	Responses	Percent of Total Respondents by Years in the Park	Responses	Percent of Total Respondents by Years in the Park
	<b>Aware</b>		<b>Unaware</b>	
<1 years	0	0%	6	100%
1 to 5 years	15	75%	5	26%
6 to 10 years	10	77%	3	27%
11 to 15 years	5	100%	0	0%
>15 years	5	83%	1	17%
Not Reported	0	0%	10	100%
<b>Total</b>	35	58%	25	44%

### Impressions of the Partnership

The data presented in the following tables represents only the responses by the 35 individuals aware of the partnership.

### Q4: HOW DID YOU LEARN THAT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WAS AVAILABLE FROM THE EPA?

Of those Aware, notified by:	Responses	Percent of Total Respondents Aware of Partnership
Training	17	49%
EPA Recruitment	5	14%
NPS Recruitment	17	49%
Newsletter	3	9%
Colleague	7	20%
Agency Website	6	17%
Publication	3	9%
Other	5	14%

Note: Percentages will not add to 100%. Respondents were able to choose more than one response.



**Q5: WAS IT YOUR DECISION TO  
ACCEPT THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	26	74%
No	9	26%
No Response	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q6: HAD IT BEEN YOUR DECISION, WOULD  
YOU HAVE ACCEPTED THE TECHNICAL  
ASSISTANCE?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	7	78%
No	2	22%
No Response	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q7: IF THE EPA HAD APPROACHED YOUR  
PARK ON ITS OWN WITH THE OFFER  
OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, WOULD YOU  
HAVE ACCEPTED IT?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	29	83%
No	2	6%
Maybe	3	9%
No Response	1	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q7A: WHY OR WHY NOT?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Desire to improve operations, EPA has expertise from which Parks can benefit	13	37%
If needed	2	6%
Skepticism of EPA intentions	3	9%
Other	3	9%
No Response	10	29%
Note: Some respondents gave more than one response. This question was open ended.		

**Q8: DID YOU RECEIVE ASSURANCES THAT  
THE INFORMATION WOULD NOT BE  
USED IN AN ENFORCEMENT ACTION?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	28	80%
No	5	14%
No Response	2	6%
<b>Total</b>	35	100%

**Q9: WOULD YOU HAVE ACCEPTED  
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IF YOU HAD NOT  
RECEIVED SOME ASSURANCES THAT THE  
INFORMATION COLLECTED WOULD NOT BE  
USED IN AN ENFORCEMENT ACTION?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	11	31%
No	13	37%
No Response	11	31%
<b>Total</b>	35	100%

**Q10: DID THE POTENTIAL TO BENEFIT FROM  
ANY OF THE FOLLOWING INCREASE YOUR  
ENTHUSIASM FOR THE PROGRAM?**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Technical Assistance that meets needs of Park	31	89%
Cost savings	27	77%
Opportunity to leverage resources not previously offered	25	71%
Opportunity to collaborate with new colleagues	25	71%
P2 assessment	34	97%
Help meeting park environmental goals	32	91%
Professional exposure/recognition	10	29%
Other	4	11%
Note: Percentages will not sum to 100% because respondents were asked to check all that apply. Percentages reflect percent of individuals aware of the partnership		

<b>Q11: SUPERINTENDENTS: HOW DID YOU NOTIFY YOUR STAFF?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Superintendents Aware</b>
Staff meeting	4	57%
Audit report circulated among staff	2	29%
Do not know	1	14%
Total	7	100%
Note: This question was open-ended. Similar responses were grouped to produce the distribution in this table.		

<b>Q12: AS A STAFF MEMBER, HOW WERE YOU NOTIFIED?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total Responses to Question</b>
Superintendent	5	18%
Staff Meeting	1	4%
NPS Regional Coordinator/Office	8	29%
Other Initiatives (training/audit process)	4	14%
Other	6	21%
No Response	4	14%
Total	28	100%
Note: This question was open-ended. Similar responses were grouped to produce the distribution in this table.		

<b>Q13: TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU AWARE THAT THE P2 COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE OFFERED TO PARKS WAS A RESULT OF A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN NPS INTERMOUNTAIN REGION AND EPA REGION VIII?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Not aware, thought was EPA effort	5	14%
Not aware, thought was NPS effort	12	34%
It was clear to me	16	46%
Other	2	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q14: HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU DEVOTE  
TO ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES  
EACH MONTH?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<1/2 day	4	11%
1 day	7	20%
2 days	5	14%
3 to 5 days	9	26%
5 days	6	17%
Other	4	11%
<b>Total</b>	35	100%

**Q15: WHAT TOOLS PRODUCED BY  
THE PARTNERSHIP DID YOU OR  
ANY INDIVIDUAL WORKING IN YOUR PARK  
FIND VALUABLE?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total Respondents Aware of Partnership</b>
Tool kit for environmental management	14	45%
Resource manual for environmental management	15	48%
Tool kit Solid Waste Management	13	42%
Intermountain Environmental Compliance Audit Program	28	90%
Green Purchasing Program	30	97%
Chemical products clean-out manual	4	13%
Other	0	0%
Note: Percentages will not sum to 100% because respondents were asked to check all that apply.		

## STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PARTNERSHIP

### Q16: WHAT ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTING ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS IN YOUR PARK WERE THE MOST CHALLENGING? (PERCENT OF TOTAL)

	Most Challenging				Least Challenging	N/A or No Response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Finding financial resources	37%	29%	20%	9%	6%	0%	100%
Time constraints	43%	17%	17%	9%	6%	9%	100%
Not enough staff	51%	26%	11%	9%	3%	0%	100%
Not enough technical knowledge	29%	17%	23%	11%	11%	9%	100%
Generating management support	6%	11%	23%	11%	37%	11%	100%
Justifying program within the context of park goals	6%	6%	17%	17%	31%	23%	100%

### Q17: WHAT ELEMENTS OF THE NPS/EPA PARTNERSHIP ASSISTANCE WERE MOST EFFECTIVE IN MITIGATING THESE DIFFICULTIES? (PERCENT OF TOTAL)

	Most Effective				Least Effective	N/A or No Response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Training	26%	37%	26%	9%	0%	3%	100%
Regulatory Compliance Info	34%	43%	11%	3%	3%	6%	100%
P2 Info	26%	31%	29%	3%	3%	9%	100%
Technical Assistance	46%	26%	17%	3%	3%	6%	100%
Cost savings	20%	17%	34%	11%	9%	9%	100%
Access to additional resources	20%	26%	34%	9%	6%	9%	100%
Collaboration with new colleagues	9%	26%	17%	29%	9%	11%	100%
Help in meeting park goals	20%	34%	31%	6%	0%	9%	100%
Managerial encouragement for P2 or partnership	11%	20%	31%	20%	9%	9%	100%
EPA/NPS vision/mission for P2	9%	20%	26%	26%	9%	11%	100%
Joint EPA/NPS compliance assistance approach	34%	31%	26%	0%	3%	6%	100%

<b>Q18: DID THE PARTNERSHIP CREATE NEW CHALLENGES OR INTENSIFY EXISTING DIFFICULTIES?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Yes	16	46%
No	18	51%
No Response	1	3%
Total	35	100%

<b>Q18A: IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY THE DIFFICULTIES YOU ENCOUNTERED?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total "Yes" from Q18</b>
Budget constraints/Funding Allocation	8	50%
Insufficient manpower/ technical knowledge	5	31%
Time constraints	1	6%
Highlighted existing compliance issues	1	6%
No Response	1	6%
Total	16	100%
Note: This question was open-ended. Similar responses were grouped to produce the distribution in this table.		

<b>Q19: WAS THE PARTNERSHIP EFFECTIVE IN ASSISTING THE PARK TO MEET ANY OF THE FOLLOWING GOALS?</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Response</b>
Completing Audit	29	1	5
Reducing solid waste	16	8	11
Reducing hazardous waste	24	4	7
Change to green chemicals	21	5	9
Training park personnel on compliance issues	23	4	8
Providing tools, training, and Technical Assistance on environmental issues	25	2	8
Note: A number of respondents responded that the listed goal was only a park goal and did not indicate whether the partnership was effective or ineffective. These responses are reflected under "No responses."			

**Q20: WERE THERE P2 OR OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL  
OPERATIONAL AND/OR BEHAVIORAL CHANGES  
MADE AS A RESULT OF THE PARTNERSHIP'S WORK?  
(PERCENT OF TOTAL)**

	Least Change				Most Change	N/A or No Response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Conducted chemical products clean-out	3%	0%	23%	34%	29%	11%	100.0%
Developed a hazardous waste management plan	3%	6%	26%	23%	17%	26%	100.0%
Developed a solid waste management plan	6%	9%	11%	26%	17%	31%	100.0%
Purchasing "green" products	0%	6%	34%	23%	29%	9%	100.0%
Implementation of P2 options	3%	6%	34%	23%	9%	26%	100.0%
Additional environmental compliance issues	6%	6%	26%	17%	11%	34%	100.0%

**Q21: WERE THERE CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT OR  
PRIORITIES AS A RESULT OF THE  
PARTNERSHIP'S WORK?  
(PERCENT OF TOTAL)**

	Least Change				Most Change	N/A or No Response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Increased use of EPA technical assistance	6%	14%	29%	14%	6%	31%	100%
Systematic measurement of environmental performance	3%	23%	31%	14%	6%	23%	100%
Identification of cost savings	11%	17%	26%	14%	9%	23%	100%
Other included: Additional Funding, Employee training, Compliance/Haz Mat, Commitment from Park management							

**Q22: DO YOU HAVE SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING  
THE TOOLS, TRAINING, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
YOU RECEIVE FROM THE PARTNERSHIP?**

Provide additional and on-going funding

Keep up flow of information about program. Often unaware of program because new to Park.

Audit and report writing adds to bureaucracy

Maintain momentum of program. In some cases, never received assistance in areas promised.

Partnership successful in helping park achieve goals.

Note: This question was open-ended. The responses above represent a sampling of those received.

**Q23: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT  
SEEKING ENVIRONMENTAL  
ASSISTANCE FROM EPA?**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Great - Appreciate the help and expertise	9	43%
Have no problem seeking assistance	7	33%
If needed, I would seek assistance.	2	10%
Somewhat suspicious	2	10%
Would use, but need to know who to contact for what issue	1	5%
Total	21	100%
Note: This question was open ended.		



**Attachment 5**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INTERMOUNTAIN  
REGION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR NPS AND  
EPA HEADQUARTERS PERSONNEL**



**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
INTERMOUNTAIN REGION AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
Telephone Interview Questions for NPS and EPA  
Headquarters Personnel**

This telephone survey will help us understand the extent and nature of partnership programs within the National Park Service and Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, it is intended to measure the strengths and weaknesses of the National Park Service (NPS) Intermountain Region and Region VIII Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Partnership Program.

### GENERAL

1. What is your position at NPS or EPA?
  
2. How many years have you worked for the NPS or the EPA?
  - ☐ Less than a year
  - ☐ 1 to 5 Years
  - ☐ 6 to 10 Years
  - ☐ 11 to 15 Years
  - ☐ > 15 years
  
3. How many years have you worked in your current capacity?
  - ☐ Less than a year
  - ☐ 1 to 5 Years
  - ☐ 6 to 10 Years
  - ☐ 11 to 15 Years
  - ☐ > 15 years

### PARTNERSHIPS

4. Does the NPS or the EPA support the concept of partnering with other governmental entities or private parties to accomplish Agency goals? If the answer is no, interviewer will skip to question 14. If yes, continue with question 5.
  - ☐ Yes      ☐ No
  
5. How does the Agency support and promote Partnerships? Interviewer will request more detailed information regarding each checked item.
  - ☐ Providing financial resources
  - ☐ Providing management support
  - ☐ Providing recognition to staff engaged in partnering activities
  - ☐ Providing training on effective strategies for partnering
  - ☐ Including it as a goal in staff performance evaluations
  - ☐ Providing funds to evaluate partnerships
  - ☐ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
  
6. How are regional offices informed about support (e.g., technical, financial, etc.) for partnering activities?
  
7. What partnerships have been most successful, and why?
  
8. What partnerships have been least successful, and why?

**9.** Have you been involved in a partnership?

☐ Yes      ☐ No

If yes, why did you enter into this partnership?

If not, why not?

**10.** What are the criteria by which funding assistance is provided to Partnership activities?

**11.** Partnerships are often long-term relationships. Do you provide on-going or long-term funding to support partnerships?

If so, how is this done?

If not, why not?

**12.** Is there a program to replicate successful partnerships throughout the agency?

**13.** Are partnerships between federal agencies promoted?

☐ Yes      ☐ No

If so, how?

**14.** Are there specific processes followed to establish a partnership between or among federal agencies?

☐ Yes                      ☐ No

What are these processes?

**15.** What are the key challenges to creating partnerships between and among federal agencies?

## **NPS INTERMOUNTAIN REGION /EPA REGION 8 PARTNERSHIP**

**16.** Are you aware of the partnership between NPS Intermountain Region and EPA Region 8?

☐ Yes      ☐ No

If the answer is no, are you interested in receiving information about this partnership?

☐ Yes      ☐ No

If the answer is yes, continue with question 16. Otherwise, the interview is complete.

**17.** How did you learn of the NPS/EPA Partnership?

- ☐ Presentation at a conference
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by EPA
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by NPS
- ☐ Personal involvement
- ☐ Newsletter
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Agency Website
- ☐ Publication
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**18.** If you provided support to this partnership, please describe the nature of your support? (financial support, management support, etc.)

**19.** What are the barriers to implementing such a Partnership? Interviewer will probe the specifics of each constraint identified.

- ☐ Finding financial resources
- ☐ Time constraints
- ☐ Inadequate Headquarters personnel to oversee partnership
- ☐ Generating management support
- ☐ Justifying it within the context of Agency goals
- ☐ Generating support for Regional partnering activities at Headquarters
- ☐ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

**20.** What are the strengths and weaknesses of the NPS/EPA Partnership (e.g., design, efficacy, clarity of purpose, etc.)?

**21.** What elements of the NPS/EPA Partnership would be important to include in future partnerships between the NPS and EPA? (Please rate each element as very useful, somewhat useful, or not useful.)

	<b>Very Useful</b>	<b>Somewhat Useful</b>	<b>Not Useful</b>
Technical assistance focused on the needs of the park	1	2	3
Training	1	2	3
Cost savings	1	2	3
Opportunity to leverage resources not previously offered	1	2	3
Opportunity to collaborate with new colleagues	1	2	3
Pollution Prevention (P2) assessment	1	2	3
Help implementing an EMS	1	2	3
Help meeting the park's environmental goals	1	2	3
Professional exposure/recognition	1	2	3
Other (please specify) _____			

**22.** Describe measures of success that would provide value to HQ in measuring the environmental benefits of a partnership.

**Attachment 6**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INTERMOUNTAIN  
REGION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM  
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR NPS AND  
EPA REGIONAL PERSONNEL**



**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
INTERMOUNTAIN REGION AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM**

**Telephone Interview Questions for NPS and EPA  
Regional Personnel**

This telephone survey will help us measure the strengths and weaknesses of the National Park Service (NPS) Intermountain Region and Region VIII Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Partnership Program.

**GENERAL**

1. What is your position within your Region?
- \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many years have you worked for the NPS or the EPA?

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 1 to 5 Years
- ☐ 6 to 10 Years
- ☐ 11 to 15 Years
- ☐ > 15 years

3. How many years have you worked in this capacity in your Region?

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 1 to 5 Years
- ☐ 6 to 10 Years
- ☐ 11 to 15 Years
- ☐ > 15 years

4. Do you provide environmental services to the Parks in your region now?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what services do you provide?

**TRANSFERABILITY OF NPS/EPA PARTNERSHIP**

5. Have you heard of the NPS Intermountain/EPA Region 8 Partnership Program? If the answer is no, interviewer will describe the NPS/EPA Partnership and skip to question 7. If the answer is yes, continue with question 6.

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. How did you learn of the NPS/EPA Partnership?

- ☐ Presentation at a conference
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by EPA
- ☐ Recruitment/solicitation by NPS
- ☐ Newsletter
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Agency Website
- ☐ Publication
- ☐ Other (please specify)

7. Are you interested in developing such a Partnership in your Region? Why or why not?

☐ Yes

☐ No

8. What elements of the NPS/EPA Partnership would be important to Parks in your Region? (What would encourage them to improve environmental performance? Please rate each element as very useful, somewhat useful, or not useful.)

	<b>Very Useful</b>	<b>Somewhat Useful</b>	<b>Not Useful</b>
Technical assistance that meets the needs of parks	1	2	3
Training	1	2	3
Cost savings	1	2	3
Opportunity to leverage resources not previously offered	1	2	3
Opportunity to collaborate with new colleagues	1	2	3
Pollution Prevention (P2) assessment	1	2	3
Help implementing an EMS	1	2	3
Help meeting my park's environmental goals	1	2	3
Professional exposure/recognition	1	2	3
Other (please specify)_____			

9. What are the barriers to implementing such a Partnership in your Region? Interviewer will probe the specifics of each constraint identified.

- ☐ Finding financial resources
- ☐ Time constraints
- ☐ Inadequate personnel
- ☐ Lack familiarity with subject matter
- ☐ Generating management support
- ☐ Justifying it within the context of park goals
- ☐ Generating support for partnering activities
- ☐ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. What topic areas would individuals working in Parks in your Region like to see covered by publications associated with an environmental partnership? If the "Other" category is checked, interviewer will focus on what additional tools would be useful for the Region's parks.

- ☐ Guidance on Environmental Management Systems
- ☐ Guidance on solid waste management
- ☐ Resource manual for conducting an environmental compliance audit
- ☐ Guidance on green purchasing
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

## **STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF PARTNERING**

**11.** Has your Region participated in other Partnerships?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, describe these Partnerships and what made them successful or not.

**12.** What factors/incentives exist in your Region, or should be encouraged, to support development of such a Partnership in your Region?



**Attachment 7**

**EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND  
REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

### **EPA HEADQUARTERS INTERVIEWS**

#### **Prevention Integration Branch, Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances**

This EPA headquarters staff member has worked at EPA for more than 15 years and in her current position for nine years. In this capacity she has been involved in a number of partnerships designed to advance the goals of her Division. For example, one partnership sought to “green” the product line of non-profits employing blind and severely disabled people. Another partnership involved electronics and a third addressed the development of sustainability practices involving the Park Service in Washington. This EPA staff member reported that EPA supported partnerships primarily through public communications, financial resources, and dedicated staff. She believes that EPA’s public communications efforts are the most important means to promote partnerships. In addition to support for partnerships outside the Agency, she noted the Agency’s support for collaborations within the Agency. Most partnerships had some sort of signed agreement, but there was no obligation to draft and sign a contract. She mentioned that the Washington based Park Service partnership had no such agreement.

This EPA headquarters staff member identified a common mission and set of goals as critical to enhancing partnership effectiveness. She described it as important for the parties to “all march in the same direction.” Where the partnership originates – either at the Headquarters or Regional level – is immaterial. Financing mechanisms to support partnership activities are not standardized and vary considerably depending on the needs of the partnership. The agencies tend to negotiate this aspect on an ad hoc basis as they formulate the partnership. The length of partnerships is similarly variable, dependent on the issue it is designed to address. Staff turnover may also play a role.

She is aware of the NPS/EPA partnership and initially had an informal agreement with the group to provide P2 support. However, as the Partnership took on a mission broader than P2, her office was unable to provide support. Although she was not directly involved, she did indicate that she believed the key strength of this Partnership to be the long-term commitment of its champions. Furthermore, she identified training, technical assistance, additional resources, EMS support, and support for Park environmental goals as important elements of future partnerships. In addition, she identified another NPS program that supports and awards parks for environmental leadership – the Centers for Environmental Innovation.

One of the most difficult aspects of evaluating partnerships, according to this staff member, is identifying measures of success. Clear goals and the accomplishment of those goals, however, can serve as measures of success in the absence of other measures.

#### **Office of Planning, Prevention, and Compliance, Federal Facilities Enforcement Office, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance**

This EPA headquarters staff member has worked at the EPA for more than 15 years and in his current position for the past five years. Although he is unaware of the NPS/EPA Partnership, he has been involved in an inter-agency partnership with the Veterans Administration. He believes

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

Partnerships to be valuable in terms of promoting EPA goals. He cited no particular protocol for initiating a partnership, but did indicate that it was critical to get support from decision-makers. He cautioned against approaching the ultimate decision-makers, the political appointees, initially, as they would provide a second avenue through which to gain approval in the event the partnership was not endorsed at the program level. Once the partnership is established, he mentioned that the Agency has a role to play in subsidizing compliance assistance activities and providing manpower.

As noted above, this EPA headquarters staff member is currently involved in a partnership with the Veterans Administration (VA). This partnership is the result of a pattern of repeat violations occurring at VA hospitals and documented in 45 inspection reports. A review of these reports revealed a pattern of RICRA and SPCC violations. EPA sent a letter to the VA with a copy of its findings. The VA recognized that it needed to change its procedures and update its environmental protocols. EPA and the VA signed a commitment statement that outlined the intent of the partnership to facilitate the process of improving the VA's environmental performance. EPA provided both the manpower and the funding for this partnership. A consultant was hired to visit the VA hospitals with EPA staff. In the coming months, EPA will conduct seventeen reviews of VA sites to assess the partnership's progress. However, the fact that the VA recognized the need to change is a critical element of ensuring the partnership's success.

One stumbling block that this staff member mentioned centered on the issue of funding. If the VA were contributing to the cost of EPA's efforts, they might pay more attention to the results. An environmental partnership may also suffer if it does not focus on specific environmental goals. Further, it is important to allow sufficient time to identify violations and provide help in fixing them. Finally, he emphasized the importance of having a partnership champion within each agency.

### **Federal Facilities Enforcement Office, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance**

This EPA staff member has worked at the EPA for more than 15 years and in his current capacity for ten years. He primarily works to provide compliance assistance to other federal facilities. This work stems from an Executive Order that requires all federal agencies to comply with EPA regulations. As a result, much of his work involves partnerships between the EPA and other federal agencies to help them come into compliance. He has found that partnerships are a necessity if federal agencies are to cooperate with regulations without the use of enforcement action.

Partnerships are promoted to the extent that the outcome will address the needs of both agencies involved. Other types of support or encouragement, such as financial resources or management support, spring from the ability to identify mission goals that the partnership is likely to address. To be successful, partnerships must be mutually beneficial and expectations carefully managed. Even the identification of common goals does not ensure success. If the burden of responsibility or the benefits are disproportionate, the partnership may not succeed. Furthermore, the agencies involved in the partnership are likely to have different financial means. The Department of Defense, for example, does not need financial support, nor will the offer of such support encourage them to participate in a partnership whose goals do not address some of their own. A smaller agency,

## EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS

however, may be attracted to a partnership because of the financial support it provides to compliance initiatives. Similarly, there are no formalized channels through which information about partnerships is disseminated. Typically, however, a federal facilities manager communicates the details of the partnership to a regional counterpart, who in turn raises awareness at staff meetings. The Department of Defense actually institutionalized the process in the signed Partnership agreement.

This EPA staff member mentioned several partnerships in which he is or has been involved. He cited a program that involved the Department of Energy (DOE), a partnership to promote federal energy savings. This partnership, however, was not born out of the desire to cooperate, but the executive branch mandate that agencies must address federal energy savings requirements and the existence of EPA's Energy Star program. He also identified the Environmental Management Review (EMR) as the closest effort to a nationwide partnership among federal agencies. The 1996 EMR Pilot Program involved 16 different federal agencies, at which 22 EMRs were conducted. An EMR is "a review of an individual facility's program and management systems to determine the extent to which a facility has developed and implemented specific environmental protection programs and plans which, if properly managed, should ensure compliance and progress towards environmental excellence."<sup>1</sup> The EMR aims to encourage uniformity and like-mindedness among government agencies regarding environmental stewardship.

There are no formal mechanisms for taking a successful partnership and replicating it across the country. Partnership models typically spread by referral. For example, this EPA headquarters staff member might suggest that an interested party speak to Mike and Marie about the Intermountain Region Partnership before embarking on one of their own. One critical element of a partnership, its champion, cannot be replicated. The personality of the partnership leader is critical to its success, particularly on account of EPA's role as a regulator. This potential barrier to partnership success is often intensified because the compliance and assistance branches of the EPA do not communicate well.

This EPA headquarters staff member is aware of the Intermountain Region's efforts. He provided financial assistance to this partnership at different points in time and often highlighted it to individuals interested in starting something similar.

This EPA headquarters staff member commented that the most important contribution that a successful partnership can make in terms of furthering partnerships is to transfer the technology used. The products that come from collaboration are often much better as they incorporate multiple perspectives. However, transferring the product is often less effective than promoting the partnership. The partnership may lead to on-going collaboration.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. EPA, *About Environmental Management Reviews*, EPA Online, 2003.

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

### **EPA REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

#### **Federal Facilities Manager, EPA Region 1**

This EPA Regional staff member works in the Federal Facilities Program in EPA Region 1. She has worked at EPA for more than 15 years and in her current position for approximately 13 years. In this capacity, she provides parks with environmental services, which include Environmental Management Reviews, training sessions, and environmental mentoring. Recently, EPA Region 1 and its NPS counterparts held a compliance 101 seminar for Park superintendents and deputy superintendents. EPA and NPS collaborated on the content to ensure that it was aptly targeted to the NPS audience. This seminar was prompted by the discovery of major violations at the Cape Cod National Seashore. Seminars are offered quarterly by the Federal Facilities Program. She also mentioned that her department was involved in a mentoring program which pairs environmental performers with those federal facilities in need of guidance. In one instance, a Coast Guard facility in the Performance Track program was paired with the Cape Cod National Seashore to help them improve their environmental performance.

This EPA Regional staff member is aware of the Intermountain Region Partnership and expressed considerable interest in any Partnership tools generated to help the Parks. Financial constraints and generating management support were cited as key barriers to partnership development. However, she believes that basic guidance on compliance issues can have a tremendous impact. Material handed out at her seminars often include a list of on-line resources, sections of the Yellow Book Guide to Enforcement and Compliance, and additional materials on the basic principles of compliance. While she supports green purchasing programs, she believes that the focus should be on compliance and then beyond compliance.

She did not cite any formal ways in which partnerships are promoted at EPA. However, she felt that EPA's mission to bring facilities into compliance acted as an incentive. In addition, the preference for compliance assistance as opposed to enforcement acted as an incentive.

#### **Federal Facilities Manager, EPA Region 6**

This EPA Regional staff member works in the Federal Facilities Program in EPA Region Six. She has worked for the EPA in this capacity for seven years, but has been an employee of the EPA for more than 15 years. In her current position, she has facilitated three Environmental Management Reviews with the Park Service.

Although she was aware of Mike Schene's activities in the Intermountain region, particularly with respect to the environmental audits, she was not aware that this program was supported by a partnership with the EPA. She expressed interest in developing a similar partnership as a means of increasing communication between the Park Service and the EPA. Further, she believes that such a partnership would assist and it would be her intention to assist the parks with environmental issues and concerns. Such a partnership would certainly increase the resources available to the parks.

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

She felt that all aspects of the Partnership would benefit parks in her region. She specifically highlighted the utility of the resources offered by the Partnership. She felt that parks might be afraid to call or touch base with EPA, but that under the umbrella of a Partnership this fear would subside. Both EPA and NPS would benefit from elimination of this barrier, as new ideas would be free to flow from one agency to the other.

Finally, she spoke at length about a Partnership between the State of Texas, the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Energy (DOE), EPA, and NASA in which she is involved. This Partnership was initiated by the DOD's regional Environmental Office to focus on pollution prevention (P2) at the multiple sites that the DOD maintains in Texas. The emphasis of the program is to bring these parties together to discuss the environmental issues faced on military bases and other DOD sites. So productive has the "round table" environment been to the development of a tailored P2 program, that the Partnership decided to expand its coverage beyond P2 in 2002. Quarterly meetings are held across the state, hosted by a different base each quarter, to ensure that the momentum is maintained. It is now known as the Texas Environmental Partnership and has an official charter to document the commitment of the various parties involved. Although the EPA has not funded the Partnership itself, it has lent financial support to a number of the programs developed by the Partnership.

### **Federal Facilities Manager, EPA Region 9**

This EPA Regional staff member works in the Federal Facilities Program in EPA Region 9. He has worked in this position for a little more than a year, but has been with the EPA for 13 years. He is in the process of developing a strategy to provide environmental services to the parks in Arizona.

He heard about the Partnership from a colleague and in fact mentioned that his region has recently joined. This work, however, is limited to the states under his jurisdiction that lie within the Intermountain region. He does support the idea of a broader Partnership, feeling that the parks in his region would benefit from the technical assistance and would appreciate the cost savings that would result from pursuing improved environmental compliance through such channels. For example, a resource manual for conducting compliance and P2 audits would benefit the parks in his region. In addition, he suggested that his parks would benefit from a collection of success stories or examples of problems faced and solutions implemented at other parks. This EPA Regional staff member did note that the lack of interest in such activities at the park level might present a barrier to establishing such a Partnership.

He mentioned that the Forest Service approached the EPA about involvement in the Federal Network for Sustainability, which among other things encourages the use of green products, specifically the use of recycled copy paper. Unfortunately, the program was not wildly successful because of the cost of the products.

There is a tremendous amount of interest in partnerships, particularly among upper level management. This EPA Regional staff member feels that there need to be more ways for federal agencies to work together, apart from the relationship as regulatee and regulator. He finds that there is substantial benefit in knowing what your client wants.

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

### **NPS HEADQUARTERS INTERVIEWS**

#### **Environmental Manager, Park Operations and Education**

This NPS Headquarters staff member is an Environmental Manager at NPS Headquarters. He has worked for the NPS for eleven years and in his current capacity as Program Manager for four years. He has never participated in or initiated a partnership, primarily because he has not found a suitable counterpart to engage in such an undertaking.

Although a colleague alerted this NPS Headquarters staff member to the existence of the Partnership before he became Program Manager, he has never been involved with it. Based on his understanding of the Partnership, he felt that it provided valuable technical assistance to the parks. In addition, he identified the training, additional resources, P2 assessment, professional recognition, and opportunity to collaborate with new colleagues as useful elements of the Partnership. He felt that the parks would benefit from compliance assistance. He also indicated that he did not see a role for the Partnership in helping the parks implement an EMS or achieve their environmental goals. The fundamental perspective of the two organizations is sufficiently different to make such collaboration difficult.

In discussing partnerships in general, he indicated that the NPS is supportive of such endeavors. However, no formal channels exist for establishing partnerships or securing funding for them. The manner in which the Park Service supports Partnerships depends on the individuals involved and the support they request. He felt that for a partnership to be successful there needed to be benefits to participation for both parties involved.

### **NPS REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

#### **Regional Environmental Engineer**

This NPS Regional staff member has worked for the Midwest Region of the National Park Service as an Environmental Engineer and Hazardous Waste Specialist for more than fifteen years. In this role, he provides parks in the Midwest Region with a number of environmental services, including hazardous waste clean up, environmental audit support, and fuel tank upgrades. Currently, he is working with the parks to implement EMSs.

He is familiar with the NPS Intermountain Region/EPA Region 8 Partnership, having been made aware of it by Mike Schene and Marie Zanolwick when the Partnership was first established. At its inception, the NPS Intermountain Region/EPA Region 8 Partnership was centered around a P2 Audit. When the NPS shifted the boundaries of its regions, several former Intermountain Region states became Midwest Region states. These states remained EPA Region 8 states, however. It was at this point that the Partnership approached the Midwest Region about participating in the Partnership. The Midwest Region had begun implementing an environmental audit process. With this effort underway, it declined the offer to join the Partnership and to implement the P2 audit.

## **EPA AND NPS HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL INTERVIEWS**

This NPS Regional staff member is certainly interested in forming partnerships in the future. He has had experience working with other federal agencies, but none of this work was related to a partnership. He felt that the recent Memorandum of Agreement between the NPS and EPA regarding working with park concessionaires on environmental management systems would lead to the creation of many partnerships between the two agencies going forward. Having used the EPA Website extensively to support the environmental activities in his region, he felt that the agency's support of Park environmental efforts would be useful. He pointed out that collaboration with the EPA would be useful for the additional resources, the technical expertise, and the potential for cost savings. This NPS Regional staff member also identified some of these benefits as barriers to implementing a partnership as well. He believes budget, time, and personnel constraints to present problems when agencies are attempting to form partnerships.



**Attachment 8**

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, INTERMOUNTAIN REGION  
AND THE  
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION 8**

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**  
between  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, INTERMOUNTAIN REGION  
and the  
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION 8

**THIS MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MOA)** is hereby entered into by and between the National Park Service, Intermountain Region, hereinafter referred to as the NPS and the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, hereinafter referred to as the EPA.

**A. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this MOA is to reinforce and institutionalize the existing partnership between the NPS and EPA to foster environmental protection and wise stewardship by promoting a pollution prevention ethic, sustainability, and environmental compliance within the boundaries of the Intermountain Region National Parks. In addition, the NPS and EPA agree to work together to strengthen and promote the development of Environmental Management Systems (EMS) by working together to encourage ISO 14001 Certification where appropriate. We also recognize the value of transferring the Partnership model to other interested state and federal agencies.

**B. STATEMENT OF MUTUAL INTERESTS AND BENEFITS.**

The EPA and the NPS jointly benefit from the continuation of this Partnership by fostering cooperation and coordination between the two agencies, while enhancing their abilities to achieve environmental goals. The Partnership is based on collaborative use of resources to promote wise environmental stewardship within parks and the NPS has identified a need for the following assistance from EPA:

- Pollution prevention (P2) and environmental compliance technical assistance
- Training on environmental compliance, HAZ-COM, P2 and EMS
- Park-specific environmental guidance documents
- Development of a streamlined EMS protocol under ISO 14001
- Development of ISO 14001 credentials as EMS Lead Auditors
- Development and support of Partnership initiatives

The Partnership will seek opportunities to provide technical assistance that will improve NPS processes and incorporate the multi-media aspects of pollution prevention, source reduction and sustainability into its culture. By assisting the NPS in meeting its goals and objectives, the EPA will be furthering its mission of protecting human health and the environment. In addition, the NPS will assist EPA in gaining valuable experience in the following areas:

- Field audits to gain knowledge of ISO 14001 audit protocol
- Direct implementation experience of P2 technical assistance programs

- A venue to pilot innovative P2, compliance assistance and EMS approaches
- Guidance on improving the agency's technical assistance and incentive award program, such as National Environmental Performance Track Program.

The development of a pollution prevention ethic and institutionalizing EMS requires dedicated commitment, careful planning, creative problem solving, changed attitudes and sometimes, capital investments. The NPS and the EPA believe that the payoffs for this commitment are significant and will include: reduced liability; more efficient use of natural resources; reduced treatment and disposal costs; lower environmental impacts; increased environmental compliance; monetary savings; a safer work environment and improved public relations. The NPS and EPA are confident that a Partnership will make the task of realizing their shared environmental and EMS goals more manageable and that their shared efforts will have long-lasting effects in environmental protection.

#### **C. NPS SHALL:**

Continue to meet the goals and objectives outlined by its Environmental Policy by implementing its Environmental Management Systems Program.

#### **D. EPA SHALL:**

Provide technical assistance as requested to the NPS to develop tools and training that facilitate and improve pollution prevention practices and EMS implementation within the parks, relevant to the mission of the EPA and NPS as well as other assistance as described in paragraph B of this agreement.

#### **E. IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD BY ALL PARTIES THAT:**

1. **TERMINATION**. Either party, in writing, may terminate this MOA in whole, or in part, at any time before the date of expiration.
2. **PARTICIPATION IN SIMILAR ACTIVITIES**. This MOA in no way restricts the National Park Service Intermountain Region or the Cooperator(s) from participating in similar activities with other public or private agencies, organizations, and individuals.

3. **PRINCIPAL CONTACTS.** The principal contacts for this MOA are:

National Park Service  
Environmental Compliance Officer  
12795 W. Alameda Parkway  
Denver, CO 80225-0287

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Pollution Prevention Team  
999 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Denver, CO 80304

4. **NON-FUND OBLIGATING DOCUMENT.** This instrument is neither a fiscal nor a funds obligation document. Any endeavor involving reimbursement, contribution of funds, or transfer of anything of value between the parties to this instrument will be handled in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures including those for Government procurement and printing. Such endeavors will be outlined in separate agreements that shall be made in writing by representatives of the parties and shall be independently authorized by appropriate statutory authority. This instrument does not provide such authority. Specifically, this instrument does not establish authority for noncompetitive award to the cooperator of any contract or other agreement. Any contract or agreement for training or other services must fully comply with all applicable requirements for competition.
5. **RESTRICTIVE RIGHTS.** Nothing in this MOA shall be construed to restrict or limit the statutory obligations or authorities of EPA or the NPS.
6. **MODIFICATION.** Changes within the scope of this instrument shall be made by the issuance of a bilaterally executed modification.
7. **COMPLETION DATE.** This instrument is executed as of the last date shown below and expires no later than January 1, 2006, at which time it is subject to review and renewal, or expiration.

THE PARTIES HERETO have executed this agreement:

**FOR THE NPS, INTERMOUNTAIN REGION :**

Ms. Karen Wade, Director

\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_

**FOR THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY:**

Robert E. Roberts, Regional Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_